Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/004,994	JONES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	RAMY M. OSMAN	2457
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) <u>RAMY M. OSMAN</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Lawrence Aaronson (35818)</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>17 September 2008</u> .		
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>13</u> .		
Identification of prior art discussed: Garrett.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Discussed particular features of the independent claims (i.e. restricting transmission of packets) that are not clearly anticipated by Garrett. Examiner agreed that although Garrett does teach limiting capacity (¶ 41) it does not encompass retricting transmission of packets. However, Examiner mentioned that "restricting packets" is an obvious variation and that a 103 rejection would then apply to the claims.  (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)</u>		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTIFILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW on reverse side or on attached sheet.	last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, V	been filed, APPLICANT IS DAYS FROM THIS WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO
Ţ		